DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 325 UD 026 728

AUTHOR Claus, Richard N.; Quimper, Barry E.
TITLE Compensatory Education Process Evaluation: Elementary and Secondary Academic Achievement (A2) 1988-1989.
INSTITUTION Saginaw Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 38p.; For earlier report, see ED 298 222.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Formative Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; Student Improvement; Urban Areas; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2; *Michigan (Saginaw)

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a process evaluation of the Saginaw (Michigan) 1988-89 elementary and secondary Academic Achievement (A2) compensatory education programs in reading and mathematics. Funding is provided by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) Chapter 2, and by the State. Goals are the following: (1) provide intensive academic instruction for the educationally disadvantaged; (2) involve parents; (3) provide incentives for academic achievement; (4) operate staff inservice programs; (5) measure academic growth; and (6) prepare students for the general classroom. Data were analyzed from the following sources: (1) a survey of all teachers; (2) interviews with each school principal or assistant principal; and (3) observation of each teacher during an entire session. Program strengths included the following: (1) small group instruction on the elementary level; (2) individual attention; (3) use of new instructional techniques; and (4) direct instruction. Program weaknesses include the following: (1) program changes disrupted the elementary staff, and secondary A2 lacked prepared materials; (2) focus restricted to the bottom quartile of students; (3) lack of formal communication between compensatory education and regular teachers; (4) low certification standards for elementary compensatory education teachers; and (5) lack of parent participation. Recommendations for improvement are included. Statistical data are included on one table. The appendices include copies of the evaluation instruments and tabulations of responses. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306325

EVALUATION REPORT

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (A^2)

1988-1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Norman Claus
School District of the City of Saginaw
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

Saginaw Public Schools

Saginaw, Michigan

UD 026 728

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (A^2)

1988-1989

An Approved Report of the

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL

Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

Richard N. Claus, Ph.D.
Manager, Program Evaluation

Barry E. Quimper, Director
Evaluation, Testing & Research

Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent and
Dr. Jerry R. Baker, Assistant Superintendent
for Administration and Personnel
School District of the City of Saginaw

March, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
PROCESS EVALUATION PROCEDURES	4
PRESENTATION OF PROCESS DATA	5
Strengths of the A^2 Program	6
Weaknesses of the A^2 Program	8
RECOMMENDATIONS	10
APPENDICES	12
Appendix A: Chapter 1/Article 3 Process Evaluation 1988-1989 Compensatory Education Teacher Questionnaire, Teacher Observation Instrument for Grades 1-6, and Principal Interview Guide	13
Appendix B: Results of the Chapter 1/Article 3 Process Evaluation 1988-1989 Compensatory Education Teacher Questionnaire, Teacher Observation Instrument for Grades 1-6, and Principal Interview Guide	19

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The School District of the City of Saginaw operates a compensatory education delivery system in reading and mathematics consisting of two programs--elementary and secondary Academic Achievement (A^2). The elementary A^2 is both a push-in program (that operates in the regular classroom in grade one) and a pull-out program (periodically taking students out of regular classrooms) that serves 2,099 students in grades one through six. The secondary A^2 is a self-contained classroom program which involved approximately 503 students in grades seven through nine and twelve. The A^2 programs are funded by both the Federal Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) Chapter 1 and Article 3 of the State School Aid Act.

Summarized in the chart below are demographic characteristics that describe both the elementary and secondary levels of A^2 in greater detail.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAMS

Program	Grade Levels Served*	Approximate Number of Students Served	Number of Full-Time Equivalent Teachers	Number of Full-Time Equivalent Aides	Number of School Sites	Program Setting	Instructional Services
Academic Achievement, Elementary	1-6	2,099	32.0	4.0	23	Push-in (grade 1) and Pull-out (grades 2-6)	- Reading - Mathematics
Academic Achievement, Secondary	7-9 & 12	503	11.0	0.0	6	Self-Contained Classroom	- Reading - Mathematics

*Compensatory education services for first and twelfth graders started second semester.

As can be seen from the chart above, the primary purpose of the programs is to improve the reading and mathematics achievement of a designated number of educationally disadvantaged children. The children in the program are screened for entry with the California Achievement Tests--Form E (CAT). This year approximately 2,602 pupils are participating in the compensatory education programs.

The broad goals of these programs are to: 1) provide intensive academic instruction to the educationally disadvantaged, 2) involve parents in the program, 3) supply students with incentives for academic achievement, 4) operate staff inservice programs, 5) measure academic growth, and 6) prepare students to effectively meet the academic competition of the general classroom. These goals are the focus of the Compensatory Education Department's activities throughout the 1988-89 school year.

PROCESS EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A process evaluation involves monitoring a program throughout the year to determine if the program is being implemented as planned. This makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that influence a program's outcome. For these programs, the process evaluation was accomplished by means of a questionnaire, observation, and interview concerning various elements of the programs of interest to the director of the programs (see Appendix A for a copy of each of the three instruments). All compensatory education teachers were to be surveyed by questionnaire and each principal or assistant principal at the compensatory education buildings were interviewed. In addition, each elementary compensatory education teacher were observed during an entire compensatory education session. The questionnaires were distributed to the secondary respondents through inter-office mail on January 27, 1989 and to the elementary respondents at an inservice session of elementary compensatory education teacher on January 30, 1989. The completed questionnaires were to be returned via inter-office mail by February 10, 1989. The interviews and observations started February 1, 1989 and were completed by February 24, 1989.

PRESENTATION OF PROCESS DATA

The Chapter 1/Article 3 Process Evaluation Compensatory Education Teacher Questionnaire, 1988-89 (see Appendix A for a copy) was sent out to A^2 secondary teachers on January 27, 1989 and A^2 elementary teachers at an inservice on January 30, 1989. As of February 10, 1989 when results were tabulated, 5 of the 16 (31.2%) secondary teachers and 27 of the 32 (84.4%) elementary teachers had returned the questionnaire. The detailed tabulated results are presented in Appendix B.

The Chapter 1/Article 3 Process Evaluation Teacher Observation Instrument for Grades 1-6, 1988-89 (see Appendix A for a copy) was used for elementary teacher observations which started on February 1, 1989 and were completed on February 21, 1989. All elementary A^2 teachers (33 of 33) were observed either teaching a reading or a mathematics session. The results of these observations are presented in Appendix B.

The principals at all A^2 sites were interviewed using the Chapter 1/Article 3 Process Evaluation Interview Guide, 1988-89, (see Appendix A for a copy). A total of 23 elementary and 6 secondary principals were interviewed from February 1 to 22, 1989. The in-depth interview findings are presented in Appendix B.

What follows are the salient points stemming from this year's process evaluation efforts of the 1988-89 A^2 program. The five program evaluators who conducted the teacher observations and principal interviews reviewed the results and summarized them into the following categories which are presented below: strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations.

Strengths of the A2 Program

From a combined review of current process findings and the present description of the program, the following strengths listed below appear noteworthy. The data source is listed parenthetically at the end of each point.

- According to most of the elementary level compensatory education teachers (55.5%), the major strength of the program was that it provided small group instruction. The secondary level compensatory education teachers were more divided in what they saw as the major strength, offering the following: small group instruction; monthly staff inservices; sufficient funding for instructional materials; providing help to the most needy students; and offering students a chance to be successful (20.0% each). (Teacher Questionnaire)

- Both elementary and secondary principals considered the provision of individual attention within a small group setting to the high need students as the major strength of the program (47.8% and 80.0%, respectively). (Principal Interview)

- Elementary compensatory education teachers have applied a number of instructional techniques related to the new definition of reading which were provided to them through program inservices. The techniques used included: Mapping/Story Frames (used by 77.7% of the teachers); Know, Want, Learn (KWL) about a topic (used by 48.1%); directed reading-thinking activities (33.3%); and question-answer relationship (29.6%). (Teacher Questionnaire)

- Elementary compensatory education teachers spend approximately 60% of their instruction time teaching reading and the remaining 40% teaching mathematics. These proportions conform to those suggested by the program director. (Teacher Questionnaire)

- Almost all of the elementary principals and all of the secondary principals had objective timelines in reading (91.3% and 100.0%, respectively) and in mathematics (87.0% and 100.0%, respectively).

  --Most of the principals (elementary 73.9% and secondary 80.0%) used staff meetings to promote and/or facilitate the teacher's focusing on objective timelines. (Principal Interview)

  --In the 13 reading and 20 mathematics sessions observed, teachers stated the instructionl objectives. (Teacher Observation)

- Both push-in and pull-out mathematics sessions were observed at the elementary level. (Teacher Observation)

- Teacher methods generally seemed to involve direct instruction. (Teacher Observation)

- Documents showing student progress and attendance, teacher lesson plans, compensatory education schedules, and parent activities were available in a large majority of classrooms (70.0% to 100.0%). (Teacher Observation)

  --The records were found to be up-to-date and complete in 75% to 95% of those classrooms with documents. (Teacher Observation)

  --The parent contact log provided by the program director was accepted by the majority of teachers (18: 56.3%), although minor modifications were suggested. (Teacher Questionnaire)

Weaknesses of the A2 Program

After a review of current process findings found in Appendix B and the present description of the program, the following current program weaknesses appear worthy of review. Again, the data source is listed at the end of each point.

- The major weakness of the program according to 79.0% of the elementary teachers was that the program changes were disruptive to program staff. According to 60.0% of the secondary teachers the major weakness was the program's lack of prepared materials. (Teacher Questionnaire)

- Both elementary and secondary principals (30.4% and 60.0%, respectively) consider the program's focusing of services just upon the bottom quartile of students to be a major program weakness. (Principal Interview)

- Other major weakness form the standpoint of elementary principals include the provision of too many inservices for elementary compensatory education teachers and the lack of principal involvement in the planning for changes in compensatory education programming (21.7% each). (Principal Interview)

- A substantial number of elementary (74.1%) and secondary (40.0%) compensatory education teachers use informal methods of communicating with regular education teachers rather than using formal communication techniques. (Teacher Questionnaire)

- A total of 40.0% of the secondary principals do nothing to encourage coordination of regular education and compensatory education teacher activities toward their building's weekly objectives. (Principal Interview)

- Only 13.1% of the elementary principals and none of the secondary principals used classroom visits as a technique to promote/facilitate the teachers' focusing on building-wide objective timelines. (Principal Interview)

- The wide ranges in instructional hours (15.25 hours and 24 hours in reading for elementary and secondary, respectively; and 16.25 hours and 15 hours in mathematics for elementary and secondary, respectively), in preparation times (20 hours for elementary and 6 for secondary staff), and in record keeping (9.75 at the elementary and 8 at the secondary level) implies a lack of uniformity in offered services. (Teacher Questionnaire)

- A majority of the elementary compensatory education teachers (14: 51.9%) feel that there is not enough time to do record keeping, plan lessons, and prepare materials. (Teacher Questionnaire)

- Some of the elementary principals (30.4%) are concerned over the "low certification standards" for compensatory education teachers, holding that staff who will work with high need children should be chosen on the basis of expertise/experience. (Principal Interview)

- Forty percent of the secondary principals believe that the program can be improved by offering compensatory mathematics classes in those secondary buildings without them. As well, 40.0% of the secondary principals believe improvements can be made by increasing the frequency of compensatory education inservices offered at the secondary level. (Principal Interview)

- Almost all of the elementary compensatory education sessions (32: 97.0%) occurred without an aide or a parent present. (Teacher Observation)

- The parent-teacher activity form was observed in 77.0% and 70.0% of the reading and mathematics classrooms, respectively. However, only about half of the observed sheets were completed (62.0% in reading and 40.0% in mathematics). (Teacher Observation)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this year's process evaluation findings and the observations of the evaluators involved in collecting the process data, the following recommendations are offered in an effort to improve the implementation of the A^2 program in the future.

- Plan out the school year's curriculum during the summer preceding the school year. Have in place and ready-to-go all of the activities that will occur during the year and be sure that all of the necessary information has been fully communicated to all parties concerned.

- Develop a more systematic plan for communication and coordination of instructional matters on a regular basis. This plan should include methods to document communication between teachers, between principals and director, and between principals and teachers. This would also include methods of coordination of activities and objectives.

- Examine the amount of time teachers spend on instruction, preparation, and paperwork to determine if time is being spent effectively and consistently. Within this examination, consider possible ways to streamline the paperwork and/or centralize the development of instructional materials.

- Develop a system to allow input from the principals. This may include monthly conferences between principals and the program director and/or principal in-service sessions with the director.

- Initiate ways to further involve the parents. This may include such activities as teacher helpers, pamphlets, newsletters, and/or calendars.

- Incorporate secondary personnel more fully into the program. For example, provide consistent materials across all sites, conducting at least three or four in-service sessions for them, and/or have compensatory education personnel explain the purpose of their program and how it relates to regular education programs at the secondary level.

- Promote the communication of new teaching strategies by the compensatory education teachers back to the regular teachers through sharing during building staff meetings.

- In future years, consider initiating push-in sections at other grade levels, being sure to provide a consistent curriculum and inservice experience on team teaching to both compensatory education and regular education teachers. This could be done as part of a study to determine whether push-in's or pull-out's are more beneficial to students.

- Allow for the thoughtful inclusion of Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP) with Math Their Way and other inservice programs. The advice and recommendations of ITIP staff should be sought to implement this program as well as our inservice programs recommended in Appendix B that impact directly on instructional practices.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS EVALUATION
1988-1989
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

To assist in planning efforts, the Department of Evaluation, Testing, and Research requests that each Chapter 1/Article 3 staff member complete the attached questionnaire regarding program operations. Many future project endeavors will be based upon your responses and reactions to the questions contained in this instrument.

We want to obtain your individual perceptions about the programs, all responses will be kept confidential. Answer each question as it pertains to the program(s) you serve.

If you have any questions, please call Richard Claus (ext. 256).

Please complete and return the questionnaire via inter-office mail to Richard Claus, Program Evaluation Division no later than February 10, 1989.

School: _____ **Date:** _____

1. How much time do you spend teaching reading per week?

   _____ Hours per week

2. How much time do you spend teaching mathematics per week?

   _____ Hours per week

3. During an average week (Sunday through Saturday), how much time do you spend on preparation for your compensatory education classes?

   _____ Hours per week

4. Again, during an average week (Sunday through Saturday), how much time do you spend on record keeping for your compensatory education classes?

   _____ Hours per week

5. What suggestion do you have on how to keep records on parent contacts?

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

6. What techniques do you use to regularly communicate with the classroom teacher? (If possible attach an example if it exists in written form, if not please describe.)

7. Many inservice sessions and discussions have been held relative to the new definition of reading during the past few years. What reading strategies, if any, have you implemented related to this new definition in your compensatory education classroom?

8. Name one or two strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 1/Article 3 program.

Strength	Weakness

9. What recommendations would you make to improve the overall compensatory education program?

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS EVALUATION
1988-1989
TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT FOR GRADES 1-6

School: _____
Teacher: _____
Length of Observation: _____ **(Minutes)**

For the following dimensions "circle" the appropriate descriptors on the right:

Subject Area Observed: **Reading** **Mathematics**
Instructional Setting: **Pull-Out** **Push-In** **Other (please specify):** _____

Number of Students: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Aide or Parent Present: **Yes** **No**

1. What was the instructional objective that the teacher stated to the pupils?

_____
_____
_____
_____

2. Which of the following best describes the teacher input observed? [Check: O--Observed and A--Absent. A check (✓) should signify the typical mode of behavior observed, not merely a single isolated incident.]

Mode of Behavior	O	A
Mapping	____	____
Kit type activity	____	____
Chalkboard exercise	____	____
Independent practice with ditto	____	____
Teacher reading to students	____	____
Student reading to teacher/students	____	____
Choral reading	____	____
Teaching mathematics with concrete objects	____	____
Other (please specify):		
_____	____	____
Other (please specify):		
_____	____	____

Comments:

_____
_____
_____

3. Which of the following documents were available for review and their status? (Check: O--Observed or A--Absent, and C--Complete or D--Delinquent to indicate availability and status.)

Document	Availability		Status		Comments
	O	A	C	D	
Progress Reporting Form	___	___	___	___	_____
Student Attendance Book	___	___	___	___	_____
Lesson Plan Book	___	___	___	___	_____
Compensatory Education Schedule	___	___	___	___	_____
Parent-Teacher Activity Form	___	___	___	___	_____

4. What general observations, if any, do you have after this observation?

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS EVALUATION
1988-1989
PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

School: _____ **Date:** _____

1. How many of your students participate in the Chapter 1/Article 3 program?

   _____ (Head count)

2. What percent of your building's population is this head count of Chapter 1/ Article 3 participants?

   _____ (Head count) ÷ _____ (Total Student Population) x 100 = _____%

3. What are your building's reading and mathematics objectives for this week?

   Reading Objective(s): _____

   Mathematics Objective(s): _____

4. How do you promote and/or facilitate teachers (both compensatory and regular) focusing upon these objectives on a weekly basis?

   _____

5. What things have you done to encourage coordination of classroom and compensatory education teachers on these weekly objectives?

   _____

6. Knowing that staff development ideas are important for both classroom and compensatory education teachers, what staff development topics would you suggest to enhance instruction of your compensatory education staff?

   _____

7. Name one or two strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 1/Article 3 program.

Strength	Weakness

8. What recommendations would you make to improve the overall compensatory education program?

APPENDIX B

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS EVALUATION
1988-1989
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

(Elementary N=27 and Secondary N=5)

1. How much time do you spend teaching reading per week?

	Elementary	Secondary
Average hours/week	12.27	13.50
Range hours/week	15.25	24.00

2. How much time do you spend teaching mathematics per week?

	Elementary	Secondary
Average hours/week	8.44	17.50
Range hours/week	16.25	15.00

3. During an average week (Sunday through Saturday), how much time do you spend on preparation for your compensatory education classes?

	Elementary	Secondary
Average hours/week	7.78	5.00
Range hours/week	20.00	6.00

4. Again, during an average week (Sunday through Saturday), how much time do you spend on record keeping for your compensatory education classes?

	Elementary	Secondary
Average hours/week	2.86	3.60
Range hours/week	9.75	8.00

5. What suggestions do you have on how to keep records on parent contacts?

	Elementary*	Secondary
- Like the form provided by the program director	8	0
- Allow for notes, phone call, etc.	6	1
- Delete parent signature requirement	3	0
- A dated guest book/notebook instead of form	2	1
- Monthly calendar notes	1	0
- Preprinted carbonless 3 x 5 form that would be filed with parent name, date, type, and reason for contact to be checked off	1	0
- Aides should be provided to make parent contacts	1	0
- Not enough contacts to cause me a concern	0	1

6. What techniques do you use to regularly communicate with the classroom teacher?

	Elementary	Secondary
- Informal meetings	20	2
- Teacher/teacher conferences	5	0
- Notebook carried between regular and compensatory education teachers	4	0
- Weekly formal meetings with teachers	4	0
- Written notes	4	0
- Staff meetings	3	0
- Each time students are escorted to and from regular classroom report made to teacher	3	0
- Not applicable	0	3
- Take part in IEP meeting	2	0
- Computerized test scores	1	0
- Student work sheets sent back to teacher	1	0
- Separate file folder for each child	1	0
- Team teaching sessions	1	0
- Follow same timeline	1	0

*Count of respondents giving this comment by level.

7. Many inservice sessions and discussions have been held relative to the new definition of reading during the past few years. What reading strategies, if any, have you implemented related to this new definition in your compensatory education classroom?

	Elementary	Secondary
- Mapping/story frames	21	2
- Know, want, learn (KWL) about topic	13	2
- Directed reading - thinking activity (DRTA)	9	1
- Question-answer relationship (QAR)	8	1
- Prior knowledge use	7	2
- Predicting	6	0
- Virginia Soper	4	0
- Power writing	3	0
- Higher level questions	2	0
- Thinking aloud	2	0
- Problem solving	2	0
- Success in reading and writing	1	0
- Echo reading	1	0
- Story line with pictures	1	0
- Made a significant change in teaching strategy	1	0
- Modeling	0	1
- SL3R	0	1
- Fluency	0	1
- Categorizing words	0	1

8. Name one or two strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 1/Article 3 program.

Strength	Elementary	Secondary
- Small group instruction	15	1
- Once a month inservice for staff	7	1
- Sufficient money to purchase instructional materials	5	1
- Communication/coordination with classroom teachers and principal	5	0
- Help to the most needy students	3	1
- Objectives and curriculum in place to follow	3	0
- Fewer students and teachers to work with has increased program effectiveness	3	0
- Gives students a chance to be successful each day	2	1
- Frequent monitoring of student achievement	2	0
- Exposes students to test taking techniques	2	0
- Our director is an effective administrator	1	0
- Parent participation	1	0
- Competent people to do the teaching	1	0
- Math manipulatives (Math Their Way)	1	0
- Being able to work with students at different grade levels	1	0

APPENDIX B

Weakness	Elementary	Secondary
- Program changes (e.g., staff assignments, program organization, timing of changes, class sizes, lack of one to one help, etc.) were disruptive to program effectiveness	17	1
- Not enough time to do record keeping, prepare materials, and do planning	14	0
- Inadequate time for math instruction	5	0
- Lack of prepared materials for instruction	1	3
- Not enough cooperation from classroom teachers	3	0
- Insufficient time allotted for reading (i.e., 3 day)	3	0
- Too much testing	3	0
- Lack of sufficient time to cover material (30 minute period)	2	0
- Fewer building based decisions on program operations	2	0
- Incoming out-of-district students fall through the cracks as they are not eligible until late in the year	1	0
- Successful Chapter 1 programs are penalized by cutting compensatory teachers in these buildings	1	0
- Lack of parent involvement component at each building	1	0
- Applying one method solution to compensatory education students	1	0
- Too many meetings/inservices to be effective with students	1	0
- Progress reporting forms are to complicated to use	1	0
- Some teachers are not properly prepared for the areas they are teaching in compensatory education	1	0
- Having to serve as a substitute teacher too frequently	1	0
- Not enough opportunities to attend conferences in both reading and mathematics	1	0
- Aide should be available for record keeping and giving extra help	1	0

9. What recommendations would you make to improve the overall compensatory education program?

Recommendations	Elementary	Secondary
- More time needs to be allowed for the following: material preparation; planning; biweekly teacher/ teacher conferences; record keeping; and incentive activities	9	0
- Before major programming changes are made consult with compensatory education staff and tell them in June about changes in program design for the coming year and/or start program earlier in the year to allow for adjustments to be made	5	0
- Allow for more professional decisions in teaching toward which objectives rather than compulsive adherence to objective timelines	3	1
- Be consistent in distribution of pupils per teacher such that small group sizes can be maintained	4	0
- Encourage greater cooperation in working on designated objectives between compensatory and classroom teachers	3	0
- Better monetary support at start of school year	0	2
- Emphasize the strengths of the program	2	0
- Reduce emphasis of teaching toward the CAT test	2	0
- Provide more outside training/inservices by excusing staff from building/grade level staff meetings	2	0
- Allow for flexibility in subject areas taught but maintain equal case loads	2	0
- Develop/employ an active parent component	1	0
- Cut down/spread out time needed for testing	1	0
- Develop a one page teacher referral form	1	0
- Other factors beyond CAT testing should be allowed for to determine eligibility	1	0
- Compensatory education meetings should be alternated from AM to PM sessions throughout the course of the school year to spread out scheduling disruptions	1	0
- Allow staff to attend multiple conferences because of dual subject area responsibilities	1	0
- Allow flexible scheduling so students do not have to give up their electives	1	0

APPENDIX B

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS EVALUATION
1988-1989
PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

(Elementary N=23 and Secondary N=6)

1. How many of your students participate in the Chapter 1/Article 3 program?

	Elementary	Secondary
Median student count served	82	86
Range	150	129

2. What percent of your building's population is this head count of Chapter 1/Article 3 participants?

	Elementary	Secondary
Lowest percent served	10.7%	2.8%
Highest percent served	56.0%	42.0%
Median percent served	24.2%	19.7%

3. What are your building's reading and mathematics objectives for this week?

	Elementary	Secondary
Number and percent of buildings with objective timeline in -		
Reading	21 (91.3%)	5 (100.0%)
Mathematics	20 (87.0%)	3 (100.0%)*

*Mathematics programs only operate at the three secondary Chapter 1 buildings.

Comment: Building principals generally were not aware of the specific objectives for that particular week when asked initially but were able to find their timeline or contact the teacher(s) in charge of the objective timeline. The specificity of objectives assigned was in common across grade levels.

4. How do you promote and/or facilitate teachers focusing upon these objectives on a weekly basis?

	Elementary	Secondary
- Staff meetings	11	4
- Posted timeline of objectives	8	0
- Weekly bulletin and/or PA announcement	8	0
- Instructional material given in mail boxes on weekly basis	5	0
- Classroom visits	3	0
- Pre-testing on a weekly basis	3	0
- Progress charts/monitoring system of progress	3	0
- Chart average amount of time needed to master objective(s)	1	0
- All staff involved in timeline development	1	0
- Grade level meetings	1	0
- Supportive of S P committee	0	1
- Tutorial program	0	1
- Compensatory education teacher required to teach one objective weekly on building objective	1	0
- Nothing	0	1

5. What things have you done to encourage coordination of classroom and compensatory education teachers on these weekly objectives?

	Elementary	Secondary
- Staff meeting to focus on objectives and schedule	17	3
- Establish and maintain communication between regular and compensatory education teachers	8	1
- Teacher conferences each semester (regular and compensatory education teachers)	7	0
- Compensatory/regular education teachers jointly select objectives, plan timeline, and voluntarily work toward the achievement of objectives	4	2
- Monitoring of instruction/lesson plans	3	0
- Nothing, voluntary interactions	0	2
- Require children to take textbook and materials to compensatory education room	1	0
- Provides materials to all teachers	1	0
- Weekly teacher conferences (regular and compensatory education teachers) during physical education classes	1	0
- Use pre- and post-test results to monitor progress	1	0
- Trouble shooting committee meet with compensatory education teachers	1	0
- Public address system announcement	1	0
- Act as feedback linkage between teachers	1	0

6. Knowing that staff development ideas are important for both classroom and compensatory education teachers, what staff development topics would you suggest to enhance instruction of your compensatory education staff?

	Elementary	Secondary
- More ideas/strategies for the new definition of reading	6	1
- Increase "math our way"	6	0
- Ideas to motivate slow learners	3	2
- Coordination of ITIP procedures with mapping and other new strategies	3	0
- How teachers can communicate effectively with each other (inter-personal relationships)	3	0
- Following through on objective work between compensatory and regular education teachers	3	0
- Parent involvement ideas	1	1
- Activities to enhance classroom management through self-discipline of students	2	0
- Team teaching concept	2	0
- District-wide inservice on new definition of reading by outside expert	2	0
- Working with CAT/MEAP scores to insure grade level achievement	2	0
- Ways to incorporate counselors or their impact into the compensatory education program	2	0
- Learning styles/individual differences	1	0
- Training for substitutes to enhance communication and instruction	1	0
- Informal assessment techniques in reading/mathematics to better diagnose problems	1	0
- Training in science and social studies	1	0
- Inservices for building administrators (instructional leaders) in the new techniques	1	0
- Techniques to enhance communication skills of students at grade level and beyond	1	0
- Time on task	1	0
- Cooperative learning	1	0
- Activities to enhance student self-concept	1	0
- Task analysis	1	0
- Activities to impact test taking skills	1	0
- Activities to enhance study and note taking skills	1	0
- Session for regular education teachers on what compensatory education is all about	0	1
- Techniques for teachers to set higher expectations with their students	0	1

7. Name one or two strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 1/Article 3 program.

Strength	Elementary	Secondary
- Provides help to high need children in small groups (more individual attention)	11	4
- Increased monitoring of students by objective timeline (accountability)	9	0
- Early identification of need and provision of service to needy student on essential objectives	4	0
- Strong compensatory education teachers	3	1
- Helps students gain skills they may not have mastered at the elementary level	3	0
- Inservice program for staff with innovative ideas	3	0
- Push-in program	3	0
- Close working relationship between regular and compensatory education teachers	3	0
- Success experiences provided pupils/students	2	1
- Addition of first grade pupils	2	0
- Regular and compensatory education teacher conference	1	0
- Compensatory education teacher teaching mapping techniques to the rest of the staff	1	0
- Strong program district-wide leadership	1	0
- Helps lower student/teacher ratio	1	0
- Greater parent participation	1	0
- Focuses in on practical applications of reading	0	1
- Teachers' schedules full day without help from principal	1	0

Weakness	Elementary	Secondary
- Focusing upon the bottom quartile of students	7	3
- Too many inservice sessions	5	0
- Lack of principal involvement in planning for changes in compensatory education	5	0
- Low certification standards for compensatory education teachers	3	1
- Pull-out program fragments learnings for pupils who need more structure	3	0
- Lack of coordination between objectives and activities	2	0
- Compensatory education services start too late	2	0
- High need buildings lost compensatory education staff	2	0
- Lack of adequate progress with compensatory education students	2	0
- Too many students for program to be successful	1	1
- Should use more than test scores as student selection criteria	1	1
- Each building should have at least one full-time compensatory education person	1	0
- Math focus not needed in some buildings	1	0
- Math program needed in secondary west side sites	0	1
- Parent inservice lacking	1	0
- Parents see program as being special education	0	1
- Facilities lacking	1	0

Weakness (Cont'd)	Elementary	Secondary
- Limited resources	0	1
- Not enough done for non-academic needs	0	1
- Scheduling changes caused by three changes in student eligibility cut-offs lead to scheduling problems	0	1
- Curriculum being driven by test results (CAT/MEAP)	1	0
- Compensatory education teachers should share what they have learned at inservice sessions	1	0
- The director should do more monitoring of staff after staff problems have been identified	1	0

8. What recommendations would you make to improve the overall compensatory education program?

	Elementary	Secondary
- Hand pick staff on the basis of expertise/certification to help high need kids	7	1
- Develop a cluster "parenting" programs	3	1
- Increased coordination/dialogue between compensatory and regular education teachers	4	0
- Each building should have at least one full-time compensatory teacher until the percent of needy is significantly lowered over a number of years	3	0
- Different way to schedule meetings so they don't take away from the same students instructional time	3	0
- Statement of program design at year's end for next year to provide for a smoother start-up in the fall	2	1
- Involvement of principal/staff in budget/program design	2	1
- Allow for counseling to deal with social and emotional problems of "at risk" youngsters	2	1
- More on-site visits by compensatory education director	2	0
- Increase number of students served by increasing student/teacher ratio	2	0
- Responsibility for success of program should be principals	2	0
- Add math compensatory education classes at secondary	0	2
- Increase frequency of compensatory education inservices at secondary with compensatory education director	0	2
- Better program facilities (e.g., small sized self-contained classrooms)	2	0
- Math and English compensatory education classes should be in addition to the regular classes and <u>not</u> in lieu of them	0	1
- Tracking of compensatory education students to determine if elementary participants continue to be eligible at the junior and senior high school levels	0	1
- Merit pay should be provided exceptional compensatory education teachers	0	1
- Each teacher should attend a workshop on a yearly basis related to teaching compensatory education students	0	1

8. (Continued)

	Elementary	Secondary
- Additional preparation time for compensatory education teachers should be provided	1	0
- More than three days of reading should be allotted per week at buildings with little or no math problems	1	0
- Compensatory teachers should not be pulled away from the buildings during the month of September as buildings start up	1	0
- Explore the model program of Abbottston as described in the February, 1989 Educational Leadership	1	0
- Increase ability of compensatory teachers to work with specific discipline problems	1	0
- Begin compensatory education classes in kindergarten	1	0
- Include as a measure of program success the percent change in students in the following year's program at each building	1	0
- Inservice staff on how to establish effective interpersonal working relationships	1	0
- Provide an aide to "over-loaded" teachers	1	0
- Group students by need level and diversify schedule so that those who are most needy (those with the lowest percentile scores) have proportionally more compensatory educational instructional time	1	0
- Selection process should allow for teacher observations along with test scores	1	0
- Do whole grade testing to see how program effects all first grade students not just compensatory education students to determine the overall effectiveness of the push-in program	1	0

APPENDIX B

CHAPTER 1/ARTICLE 3 PROCESS EVALUATION
1988-1989
TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT FOR GRADES 1-6

(Elementary Teachers N=33)

Length of observation in minutes:

	Reading	Mathematics
- Average length	29	35
- Shortest session	16	24
- Longest session	60	60

Instructional setting of observed classes:

	Reading	Mathematics
- Pull-out	13	10
- Push-in	0	10

Number of students in observed classes:

	Reading	Mathematics
- Average number	5	8
- Fewest number	2	1
- Largest number	11	19

Number of classes where aide or parent was present:

Reading	Mathematics
0	1

APPENDIX B

1. What was the instructional objective that the teacher stated to the pupils?

Reading

- Details - how one determines what is taking place	3*
- Main idea - comprehension	3
- Analogies	2
- Multiple meanings	2
- Review of comprehension skills	1
- Spelling -identify the correctly spelled word out of a list of four words	1
- Word recognition	1

Mathematics

- Addition with concrete objects	9
- Basic addition facts linked with everyday life	2
- Review of fractions (addition)	2
- Vocabulary/usage of addition and subtraction terms in word problems	2
- Halves/fractions with shapes	1
- Two digit addition and subtraction	1
- Geometry - naming shapes	1
- Place values/rounding to the nearest thousands place	1
- Multiplication of two and three digits	1

*Count of respondents giving this comment by level.

2. Which of the following best describes the teacher input observed?

Mode of behavior observed:	Reading	Mathematics
- Mapping	4	0
- Kit type activity	2	4
- Chalkboard exercise	3	3
- Independent practice with ditto	6	4
- Teacher reading to students	4	2
- Student reading to teacher/students	9	7
- Choral reading	4	1
- Teaching mathematics with concrete objects	-	12
- Other:		
--Question and answer	6	0
--Guided practice	4	6
--Homework	1	0
--Journal entry	1	0
--Oral recitation	1	0
--Dictionary practice	1	0
--Drill and practice	0	3
--Modeling	0	2

APPENDIX B

	Reading	Mathematics
Comments:		
- Teacher was very enthusiastic about the success of the students	1	0
- Instructor worked well with the group	1	1
- Incorrect grammar was used by the instructor and was reinforced during the instruction	1	0
- Students knew what was expected of them	0	3
- Use of reward (e.g., Valentine candy and stickers)	0	3
- Students appeared very enthusiastic	0	2
- Use of pennies to help students with addition problems	0	1
- Real life examples were incorporated into the instruction	0	1
- Students felt free to check with the teacher regarding their progress on the activity	0	1
- Teacher drew cartoon figures for each student as an visual aid	0	1
- Compensatory education instructor also helped non compensatory education students in a push-in environment	0	1
- Instructor divided their time equally between regular and compensatory education students	0	1

3. Which of the following documents were available for review and their status?

	Reading				Math			
	Observed		Absent		Observed		Absent	
Availability of documents:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
- Progress reporting form	12	92	1	8	19	95	1	5
- Student attendance book	12	92	1	8	20	100	-	-
- Lesson plan book	13	100	-	-	20	100	-	-
- Compensatory education schedule	11	85	2	15	19	100	1	5
- Parent-teacher activity form	10	77	3	23	14	70	6	30

	Reading				Math			
	Complete		Delinquent		Complete		Delinquent	
Status of documents:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
- Progress reporting form	10	77	3	23	15	75	5	25
- Student attendance book	11	85	2	15	18	90	2	10
- Lesson plan book	12	92	1	8	19	95	1	5
- Compensatory education schedule	11	85	2	15	19	95	1	5
- Parent-teacher activity form	8	62	5	39	8	40	12	60

4. What general observations, if any, do you have after this observation?

	Reading	Mathematics
- Push-in program appeared workable (teachers worked well together)	0	3
- Students wasted little time (work diligently)	0	3
- Teacher was very concerned about discipline and stopped often to bring order	0	3
- Well organized class using previews and reviews of the topics covered	2	0
- Teacher focused on the positive side of the student's progress	0	2
- Teacher kept a file on each student	0	2
- Good rapport was apparent between teacher/student	1	1
- Site still in need of some minor set up details	0	1
- Progress reporting form to cumbersome	0	1
- Stickers used as rewards	0	1
- Teamwork was not as obvious, yet it was harmonious	0	1
- Teacher was somewhat negative with the group	0	1
- Some students did not appear to understand what was going on, manipulatives might have been used	0	1
- Teacher works well with the students, yet is begrudging in regard to paper work and record keeping	0	1
- Objective seemed to be behind first grade curriculum. Thus it was hard to keep all students busy	0	1
- Teacher worked well with students given less than optimal conditions	0	1